

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 12-17 and 28-32 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claims 18-27 have been canceled.

New claims 28-32 have been added. New claims 28-32 are related to the cover glass having a hard coating film only on the outer surface of the cover glass substrate. Support in the specification is found at the paragraph bridging pages 22 and 23 and at the paragraph bridging pages 31-32 through page 36, and in the original claims. No new matter has been added.

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

In response, Applicants have canceled claims 21 and 22. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 21 and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Taniguchi (U.S. Patent 4,765,729).

Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mase et al. (U.S. Patent 5,693,366).

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mase et al. in view of Taniguchi.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi in view of Takeshita et al. (U.S. Patent 6,057,039).

In response, Applicants have canceled claims 18-27.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/830,875

Claims 12-14, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi in view of Yokoo et al. (U.S. Patent 4,634,270).

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi in view of Yokoo as applied to claims 12-14, 16 and 17 above, and further in view of Mase et al. (U.S. Patent 5,693,366).

In response, Applicants respectfully traverse.

While Applicants understand that the determination of patentability for a product-by-process claim is based on the product itself and not on the method of production, Applicants would like to point out inherent differences in the present invention over the prior art. A hard coating film being transferred from a transfer foil as in the present invention can be formed on only one selected side of a transparent cover glass substrate contrary to dip coating and spin coating.

The cited references do not disclose a hard coating film being formed on one side of a transparent cover glass because such is not possible with dip coating or spin coating and therefore it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the references of Yokoo et al. and Taniguchi to arrive at the present invention. In Taniguchi, a plastic spectacle lens has hard coating films on both sides of the lens substrate by dip coating or spin coating. A cover glass of the present invention is not a lens.

Yokoo et al. teaches a transparent substrate with anti-reflection coating formed on the inner and outer surfaces without a hard coat film. However, the transparent substrate taught by Yokoo et al. is made of inorganic material such as inorganic glass. Inorganic glass is hard, so

any hard coating film is not necessary for inorganic glass. Therefore, Yokoo et al. does not disclose or teach an anti-reflection coating formed on the inner surface of the cover glass substrate of thermoplastic resins without the hard coating film interposed between them.

Furthermore, in newly added claim 28 of the present invention there is a gap (air layer) between the cover glass and the display unit of portable apparatus. A liquid crystal display unit of reflection type which utilizes external light is always mounted in a portable apparatus such as a cellular phone. External light incident on the cover glass passes through the cover glass and reaches the display unit, and after reflection by the display unit it passes through the cover glass again and reaches the eye. The presently claimed anti-reflection coating of the inside of the cover glass was invented because of the discovery of the gap between the cover glass and the display unit of a portable apparatus.

In the present invention as recited in, *e.g.*, claim 30, the preformed film having an anti-reflection coating is comparatively rigid and hence is poor in flexibility; therefore, it is hard to be stuck to a curved surface and its use is limited to a flat surface or a cylindrical surface in this stage. The inner surface of the cover glass is flat or slightly concave because it is placed near the flat view plane of a display. The preformed film having an anti-reflection coating stuck to the inner surface of the cover glass substrate poses no problems with its external appearance. This obviates or simplifies the edge finishing of the preformed film having an anti-reflection coating.

The cited art neither discloses nor teaches a combination of the hard coating film on the outer surface of the cover glass substrate and the preformed film having an anti-reflection coating on the inner surface of the cover glass substrate.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/830,875

The cited references simply do not disclose or teach any such combination or variation of coatings for the inner and outer surfaces.

Newly added claim 31 is patentably distinct from Taniguchi. Taniguchi does not disclose the anti-reflection film having a decorative part by printing.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

*Bruce E. Kramer*  
*Keith B. Scala / Reg. No. 33,725*  
Keith B. Scala  
Registration No. 43,088

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 1, 2003